

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I wish to express my delight and joy that the bill has passed. When we look back in historic perspective 10 or 15 years from now, we shall realize that the proposed legislation is one of the milestones of these years.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the distinguished Senators from New York [Mr. JAVITS and Mr. KENNEDY], distinguished Senators from California [Mr. KUCHEL and Mr. MURPHY], the distinguished Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] and all other Senators who have contributed to the introduction and the passage of this bill. The National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities is a milestone and a step in right direction.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, I express my great pleasure at the action of the Senate this afternoon in passing S. 1483, the arts and humanities bill. This bill has benefited from the long-term interest and dedicated support of Senator JAVITS. Our able colleague, Senator PELL, introduced this year's version of the bill, and conducted lengthy hearings on it before his Special Subcommittee on Arts and Humanities. During the course of the hearings, many constructive and useful suggestions were made for improving the bill. Under the imaginative leadership of Senator PELL, and with the aid of his hard-working staff, the subcommittee reported the excellent version of the bill which we have passed today.

As a member of the full Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and as a co-sponsor of this legislation, I was particularly gratified to see its speedy enactment after final approval by our committee.

I think the bill will provide a vitally needed stimulus for all the branches of the arts and humanities in every locality in the United States. Under the provisions of the bill for direct grants and loans to performing groups, as well as to students of the various humanistic disciplines, I am convinced that we shall see an inspiring upsurge in activity and creativity. The passage of this bill truly marks recognition of the central importance of the arts and humanities in our American culture.

S. 1483 IS A LANDMARK IN THE DEVELOPING AMERICAN CIVILIZATION

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, America has ever been the great proving ground for the idea that the citizens of a nation are capable of governing themselves, of running their own lives and of building a humane and civilized society in the process. There have been critics of democracy, and of American democ-

racy in particular, who have argued that high cultural attainment is beyond our reach. They see Americans as a rather boorish lot who are concerned solely with increasing their possession of material goods.

A significant portion of Americans has never accepted this judgment. Sharing Walt Whitman's vision of a great literature arising from deep within the American spirit, they have attempted to show that a democracy is capable of producing great works of art and that the whole people of the democracy will form the greatest audience that any society has ever known. Indeed, as the penetrating study of the Rockefeller Panel Report on the Performing Arts points out:

There have long been thoughtful people among us who believe that the ultimate test of democracy lies in the quality of the artistic and intellectual life it creates and supports.

The action which the Senate of the United States has taken today in passing the Arts and Humanities Foundation bill is a sign that American culture, far from standing still, is pressing forward toward her appointed rendezvous with a golden age.

This bill establishes a National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities, consisting of a National Endowment for the Arts and a National Endowment for the Humanities. The National Endowment for the Arts provides matching grants to States, to nonprofit or public groups and to individuals engaged in the creative and performing arts. The Humanities Endowment provides grants and loans for research, provides fellowships and grants to institutions for training, supports the publication of scholarly works in the humanities, and fosters understanding and appreciation of the humanities.

In the arts the influence of this program will have, I believe it is safe to say, a secondary influence far greater than the primary influence of the money which the Federal Government itself awards. The impetus which this program will give to private philanthropy, to State and community effort, and to personal involvement of persons who had never involved themselves in the arts before, will produce a net effect many times greater than might be expected. As a study of State arts councils by the U.S. Office of Education shows:

Adequate financial stimulation of high quality art will result in enthusiastic participation and enjoyment by large numbers of people, in greater private support and box office income, and in gradual reduction in need for subsidies.

Equally important to the advancement of the American civilization is adequate support for activities in the humanities. Indeed, if any nation should be concerned about the humanities, that nation is the United States. This Nation was conceived in the notion that what counts most in life is that which is most human. This is what the humanities are concerned with. The report of the Commission on the Humanities reminds us:

Throughout man's conscious past they have played an essential role in forming, preserving, and transforming the social,

moral, and esthetic values of every man in every age. One cannot speak of history or culture apart from the humanities. They not only record our lives; our lives are the very substance they are made of. Their subject is every man. * * * All men require that a vision be held before them, an ideal toward which they may strive. Americans need such a vision toward which they may strive. Americans need such a vision today as never before in their history. It is both the dignity and the duty of humanists to offer their fellow countrymen whatever understanding can be attained by fallible humanity of such enduring values as justice, freedom, virtue, beauty, and truth. Only thus do we join ourselves to the heritage of our Nation and our human kind.

In today's world, when the growth of man's understanding of technology is greater than the growth of his understanding of his fellow man, it is vital that we pay some attention to the humanities, to that which is human and therefore common to all men. This is every bit as vital to our national defense as the billions of dollars we spend every year on missiles and bombs.

PROPOSED NEW LIBRARY BUILDING

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the Senate Public Works Subcommittee on Buildings and Grounds, chaired by Senator STEPHEN YOUNG, Democrat of Ohio, yesterday adopted restrictive amendments to a Senate resolution to build a new library building.

The amendments adopted included taking jurisdiction over the construction from the Office of the Architect of the Capitol and placing it in the General Services Administration, a requirement for competitive bidding on construction and equipment and restricting the authorization to \$500,000, rather than \$72,500,000, as was proposed.

The people's business ought to be handled in such a way as to demonstrate to them that their interests are being fully protected.

That is why I made the motion to uphold the view of our chairman, Senator YOUNG, that the construction of any new Library of Congress building should be handled by the General Services Administration, which has a long and excellent record in the field of public construction.

Further, I made the motion that all construction and equipment contracts on any such new building should be let only after competitive bidding, under the same procedures now applicable to other GSA contracts.

I also made the motion to reject the proposal that the bill fully authorize the construction of the new building at a cost of \$72,500,000 and that the authorization be limited to \$500,000 only, for the completion of detailed plans, design, and cost estimates.

The subcommittee agreed with me that we should not at this time fully authorize the construction of the building, because it was not yet certain whether the land adjacent to the Library of Congress could be secured and there had been no detailed plans, design, and cost estimates made and filed with the subcommittee.

By authorizing only \$500,000, as I suggested, the subcommittee made it clear

that we do not intend to make any authorizations in the dark and without full knowledge of the facts; further authorizations for the construction of the building can be made after the full facts have been obtained, and the people, through the subcommittee, have an opportunity to know all about the project.

There is no question in my mind that the Library of Congress needs an additional building and that the James Madison Memorial building is a worthy project, but I am proud that the subcommittee made it clear that we intend to see that the taxpayers' interests are safeguarded in its construction.

I intend to continue vigorously my efforts to assure that these safeguards are continued in this or any other authorization legislation adopted for this project by the Congress.

★ FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1965

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 12 o'clock having arrived, under the unanimous-consent agreement the Chair lays before the Senate the pending business, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1837) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the agreement, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], or someone whom he might designate, will be recognized for 45 minutes.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the understanding may be changed, and that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, and the Senator in charge of the bill, may be substituted for me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Arkansas will have control of the time previously designated for the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK].

The Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] will have control of 45 minutes of the time available.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to suggest the absence of a quorum without the time necessary for the quorum call being charged to the time of either side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-

consent agreement and ask that it be given immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Ordered. That, effective June 11, 1965, at the conclusion of routine morning business, during the further consideration of the bill (S. 1837) to further amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, debate on any amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT]: *Provided*, That in the event the Senator from Arkansas is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the majority leader or some Senator designated by him: *Provided further*, That no amendment that is not germane to the provisions of the said bill shall be received except for two amendments to be offered by the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Ordered further. That on the question of the final passage of the said bill debate shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the majority and minority leaders: *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have no objection to the time limitation, but I may desire to submit two amendments. One is printed, one is not. One amendment relates to the Peace by Investment Corporation; the other relates to East-West trade. I ask the majority leader to, except those amendments from the germaneness rule, if there is any problem.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the two amendments are excepted from the rule of germaneness?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Subsection 205 of the present Foreign Assistance Act provides:

If the President determines that it would more effectively serve the purposes of this title and the policy contained in section 619 (pertaining to newly independent countries), he may, in accordance with the provisions of this title, lend not to exceed 10 per centum of the funds made available for this title to the International Development Association for use pursuant to the International Development Association Act (Public Law 88-565, 74 Stat. 293) and the articles of agreement of the Association.

The bill reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations changes the law in three respects:

First. It inserts the following policy finding by the Congress:

That the United States and other free world nations place an increasing portion of their assistance programs on a multilateral basis.

Second. It includes in the agencies to which the President is authorized to transfer development loan funds to two international lending institutions—the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation, in addition to the International Development Association, to which funds can be transferred under existing law.

Third. The committee bill increases from 10 to 20 percent the amount of funds which the President can transfer to these three international institutions.

My amendments—Nos. 221 and 224 combined, which are now being considered en bloc—would delete these three committee amendments and leave the present law undisturbed.

My amendments do nothing more.

On page 12592 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 9, I have inserted a list of the loans made by the International Development Association. These are soft loans. They are repayable over the term of 50 years with an interest rate of three-fourths of 1 percent with no repayment of principal for the first 10 years.

With the United States borrowing the money to turn over to the International Development Association at more than 5½ percent interest, this means a concealed grant is going to each borrower from the International Development Association of at least 5 percent interest.

For example, the loan made to India by the International Development Association of \$300 million contains a concealed grant to India from the United States of \$15 million per year. It is concealed because, while the taxpayers of the United States are paying this \$15 million annually, it is treated by the International Development Association and the people of India as a loan, rather than a grant.

If the people of the United States and their elected representatives want to make grants, let them do it openly and knowingly.

The effect of the committee amendments continues a trend to obviate the restrictions placed on the Development Loan Fund by the Congress over the years.

The committee amendments would free an additional 10 percent of the Development Loan Funds from the following restrictions:

First. The Hickenlooper amendment, a great deterrent to expropriations of U.S.-owned property abroad.

That would go down the drain if my amendments were rejected.

Second. The safeguards for the use of Development Loan Funds for purchases in the United States provided a restriction of great assistance to our balance-of-payments problem.

That would go down the drain if my amendments were rejected.

Third. The requirement for detailed plans and cost estimates on public works projects is a safeguard.

These safeguards would also disappear if my amendments were rejected.

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12645

Fourth. The requirement for the shipment of a certain percentage of purchases in American bottoms is a safeguard.

All purchases made through the proceeds of these loans, including the additional 10 percent through the international corporations, would have no protection for American shipping.

Fifth. The restrictions on aid to Cuba, Poland, Yugoslavia, and other Communist countries are safeguards.

The international bankers lend this money wherever they see fit.

Sixth. The restriction on aid to countries shipping goods to Cuba is a safeguard.

That, too, would disappear.

Seventh. The restriction on aiding businesses abroad that will ship goods into the United States in competition with our own businesses is a safeguard.

They would ship goods into America in competition with our own businesses.

The following are safeguards:

Eighth. The restriction against aid to countries preparing for aggression against their neighbors;

Ninth. The restriction against aid to Indonesia;

Tenth. The restriction against aid to countries having no investment guarantees;

Eleventh. The restriction against aid to economically developed countries.

Rather than increasing the amount of U.S. taxpayers' dollars we permit to escape from the control of the Congress, we should reverse the trend and seek ways and means of bringing more and more of the foreign aid program in all its aspects under the close and continued scrutiny of the Congress.

Mr. President, these are conservative and mild amendments. They would only tend to retain the commitments already given. They would not seek to reverse the commitments of a previous Congress.

If I were introducing the bill, I would scrap this section entirely and have no further waste such as occurs when this money goes to international organizations and Congress loses complete control of our taxpayers' money.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendments.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, before commenting directly with regard to this matter, I wish to observe that, with regard to the alleged great waste of the taxpayers' money which has been mentioned by the Senator from Alaska—which he calls the 10-percent provision in the existing law, it has not been very wasteful. It has never been implemented because of the restrictions put on it in the appropriations act. The Senator does not know whether it would be wasted or not. It has not been done. That is an inoperative provision.

One may ask why I want this provision for 20 percent in the committee bill. This

is a matter of principle. This is the way the foreign aid program should be administered, even though it is not now so administered.

I believe it is significant that the principal sponsors of the amendment are people who, generally speaking, have always opposed foreign aid in its entirety. It is not a question of whether they are interested in passing a bill. I believe that the Senator from Alaska, if my memory serves me correctly, has voted against the aid bill for several years. Is that correct?

Mr. GRUENING. No; that is incorrect. I have at times opposed a foreign aid bill when I felt it was a bad bill. But I have sought to improve all foreign aid bills by amendment. And when they were improved I voted for them. Otherwise not.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought the Senator always voted against it.

Mr. GRUENING. That shows how misinformed the chairman of the committee is.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If the Senator has not voted against the bill, he has voted against certain provisions of it.

Mr. GRUENING. The Senator is correct. I have voted in favor of amendments that would improve the foreign aid bills, stop wasting the taxpayers' money, and stop sending money to ruthless dictators who are aggressors, who burn our libraries, permit attacks on our Embassies, and denounce us. That has been the purpose of my amendments. Some of the amendments I have sponsored and were enacted have succeeded in improving the foreign aid bill.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I say goodnaturedly that I am a little surprised that the lack of knowledge of the King's English possessed by my good friend the Senator from Arkansas, led him to make a mistake and think of us as being opposed to foreign aid.

I have voted against the bill. However, I have said that I would vote for more money for foreign aid if we could really have a decent foreign aid bill that would eliminate waste, inefficiency, and the cause of corruption in the administration of foreign aid in so many parts of the world.

I am greatly indebted to the Senator from Arkansas for giving support in the committee to the Morse amendment that is in the present bill. My amendments seek to carry out that objective with a study that would seek to outline an improved foreign aid program for us in the future.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the impression was given to the uninitiated from the discussions of the bill last year and the year before that the Senator from Oregon was opposed to foreign aid. He interprets that to mean that he is opposed to this bill.

I do not recall that the Senator has ever offered a complete substitute or an entirely new or different kind of bill.

Mr. MORSE. I know that the Senator wants to be fair.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Perhaps that will come out of this study. I hope that it will.

Mr. MORSE. I know that the Senator from Arkansas wants to be fair. We would have had a Morse foreign aid bill if the Senator from Arkansas and other Senators had been willing to adopt the long list of amendments that I have offered here on the floor of the Senate now for the past 3 years, which amounted to a rewriting of the foreign aid program. That is the kind of foreign aid I am for.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for a question.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would rather have the Senator yield for an observation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield for an observation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I pointed out last night that there are 92 countries in the international development program. A country must be a member of the World Bank in order to be a member of the Association. So 10 countries are not members of the Association.

Mr. Henderson's figures indicate to me that we have now committed \$632 million of U.S. funds. Once that money goes into the "kitty," they can evade the Hickenlooper amendment. They can evade shipping instructions. There is no appropriation control. We are at sea without a paddle. That is what it amounts to.

I do not mind being generous about this. However, I do not want to go whole hog and commit the U.S. Treasury to the keeping of people who have an interest in getting money out. That has not been our interest there. There ought to be some restraint in fairness to the taxpayers of the country.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator from Illinois, of course, has every right to his own opinion, but we differ very greatly as to what is designed to improve the efficiency of this program. The international agencies have a far better reputation in the eyes of 99 percent than does AID when it comes to efficient administration of their funds.

The amendment of the Senator from Alaska raises fundamental policy question involved in the program. As I stated before, the 10-percent provision has never been operative because of the limitation put on it by the Appropriations Committee of the House. So we are dealing here, as we often find ourselves doing in the foreign aid bill, with a kind of windmill. We argue at great length and acrimoniously about various provisions, only to find in the long run that the arguments have been largely futile, just as is this point. I am not at all sanguine, even if the 20-percent provision stays in, because under the 10-percent provision, not one nickel has been spent for this purpose, although the provision did establish a good policy.

The justification for foreign aid must ultimately stand or fall on a political base. Whether we are killing mosquitoes in Africa, or building dams in Latin America, or supplying weapons in Asia,

we are doing it for essentially political purposes. We are doing it because we hope that, if we are successful, there will emerge in the affected countries a political order which is not incompatible with U.S. interests. This does not have anything to do with trying to buy friends; it has to do with the much more subtle and complex task of trying to influence the course of events toward the development of situations more nearly in our interest than the situations which now exist.

This, of course, is the general and continuing objective of our foreign policy in all its aspects. The foreign aid program is only one of a number of instruments available to us to achieve this objective. The other instruments include old-fashioned diplomacy, the overseas information program, the activities of the Central Intelligence Agency, our Armed Forces, our commercial and trade policies, and our exchange-of-persons programs, among others. None of these is an end in itself, but rather a means to a broader end.

It should be clear that what we are talking about in this amendment is not the foreign aid program as a whole, but the particular segment of it which is called development loans and which consists of dollar-repayable loans to underdeveloped countries other than those of Latin America. Further, we are talking about a relatively small percentage—whether it be 10 or 20—of the funds available under that program. These funds, if the administration gets the full appropriation requested, will total \$780,250,000 in fiscal year 1966.

Now, these funds—which are only a little more than the Senate recently approved with a whoop and a holler for war in Vietnam—are aimed directly and exclusively at economic development in Africa and Asia. But even economic development is not an end in itself; it is a means to the end of political stability and compatibility with U.S. national interests.

I hope no one any longer deludes himself that economic development is a sufficient condition for political development. It is probably a necessary condition. At any rate, it can be a helpful contributing factor—if it is not offset by international political irritants.

The real issue involved in this amendment is whether development loans can contribute more effectively to the long-term, broad political purposes of the United States if they are administered bilaterally or multilaterally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself an additional 5 minutes.

Deeply involved in this issue are the feelings and attitudes of the people of most of the countries of Africa and Asia. These feelings and attitudes are best described as being intensely nationalistic and independent. From the comfort and security of an established world power and an affluent society, this nationalism frequently appears perverse and irrational; but we fail at our peril to try to understand it and to take account of it.

Africans and Asians know they need development assistance, and at the same time they resent their need for it. They consequently sometimes try to rationalize it as their just due. They are very sensitive about it—and especially so when they hear themselves denounced periodically in the United States generally, and particularly in the Senate, as incompetent or worse.

When development lending is done on a bilateral basis, all of the manifestations of this nationalism are compounded. When aid is extended on a multilateral basis, these manifestations are muted and diluted.

The question here is, What is the Senate trying to do? If it is trying to promote economic development in selected countries of Asia and Africa, without a constant irritant in our own relations with those countries, then a modest flexibility should be provided the President to channel some of these loan funds through the International Bank and its affiliates. But if the Senate is simply trying to assert its own brand of nationalism, then this flexibility should be denied the President and the program should be surrounded with still more restrictions and conditions, which seems to me to be its purpose.

Much has been said by the proponents of this amendment about how the use of the World Bank will take all the strings off aid and enable a group of international bureaucrats to scatter American largesse throughout the world. Do Senators think the World Bank has no standards of feasibility, no requirements for economic performance, no competence in administration and management? Why do Senators think the World Bank refused to make any loans to Brazil for several years prior to 1964? Because the Bank was not satisfied with the economic record of the Brazilian Government. Why do Senators think the World Bank has refused to make any loans to Greece? Because Greece has been in default on an international loan contracted in 1929.

That is a matter which has just been considered by our committee. The Greeks have gone to great efforts to arrive at an international agreement settling that particular loan and clearing up their back debt in order to be eligible for International Bank loans.

These are rather higher standards than AID—or the U.S. Congress, for that matter—has applied.

We hear a great deal in the Senate about GAO reports on maladministration of our own aid program. Has any Senator ever heard of an auditor's report which questioned in the slightest the administration of the World Bank?

In another title of this bill, there is an item of \$44 million to be contributed to the Indus Basin Development Fund, which is administered by the World Bank. This large project has been under way for several years, and there has not been the slightest criticism of it. What is wrong with trying to work out similar projects elsewhere?

To sum up, Mr. President, the committee bill provides that the President "after consideration of the extent of additional participation by other coun-

tries, may make available" up to 20 percent of the development loan funds to the International Bank and its affiliates. The existing law provides that he may lend up to 10 percent to the International Development Association. The existing law, incidentally, has been effectively nullified by a prohibition in the appropriation act; so the present authority has never been used.

The committee bill represents a very modest effort to encourage the President to shift a small portion of development loans from bilateral to multilateral administration. For both political and economic reasons, I strongly believe that this is the direction in which economic development programs should move, and I hope the Senate will reject the amendment of the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. There was some criticism on the floor of the Senate yesterday about loans made by the International Bank organization; that IDA had not properly made long-term, soft loans at appropriate interest rates.

What can the Senator tell us about standards of IDA, an affiliate of the World Bank, in making loans? Are they not pretty careful about loans they make, even though less interest is charged than for loans under conventional terms?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. They are.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The additional time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, how much time have I left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighteen minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 5 minutes, or as much as I wish to use of the 5 minutes.

The Senator is correct. They are called soft loans, but such loans are usually worked out and result from very careful consideration by the Bank itself, very often with an eye to a regular loan from the Bank. But because of the inability of a particular country to service a loan at the regular rate, and for the short terms on which a regular rate is based, they have to fall back on IDA. It is a complementary organization. It has complementary standards that complement the regular operations of the Bank. Over the years, the Bank has developed a highly skilled international group of technicians in the engineering, auditing, and economic fields. It has done a remarkable job in administering the affairs of the Bank. IDA is a more recent organization, which has been operating for only a few years, but I have never run into any serious criticism of the efficiency of its operation.

We fail to allow them to administer a part of our funds, but let me emphasize one point: I believe that some of the major troubles we are today encountering throughout the world stem from the relationship between the patron and the client that grows from the bilateral loan, which is the beginning of a sour and disillusioned relationship between the underdeveloped countries of the world and the United States. We, being such a large, and to them at least, rich

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12647

country, they immediately become impatient with any kind of restriction.

The most glaring instance I heard of was in Malaysia where, after long negotiations, we raised the problem of the regular interest rate. They staged a great anti-American demonstration in Kuala Lumpur because of that interest rate—the only such demonstration I ever heard of in Malaysia.

This poisons our relationship rather than improves it because of the nature that adheres to such a relationship. It is not because of David Bell or anyone else in the organization. It is inherent in this kind of program, particularly if it is a lending program. If it is a program for the eradication of malaria, or a technical assistance program for the construction of a school, it does not result in disillusionment. It is fundamentally bad for us to continue this bilateral lending program. This applies only to the lending part of the program.

Mr. CLARK. What would the Senator's comment be with respect to the criticism made here that, by encouraging multilateral loans by world organizations, Congress is losing control of the program? Have we not a good deal to say about the organization of the World Bank and its affiliates as to where loans should be made?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Technically the criticism is correct, because Congress does not have a representative on the Board. But some agency of the Government, or the administration, which is a legitimate part of the Government, of course, do have representatives on the Board. These representatives carry substantial voting weight in accordance with the constitution of the World Bank, so that they possess great influence. They do not dominate the Bank, and I do not wish them to dominate it, but they do have a substantial vote.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield 3 minutes to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, there have been many times when I have felt that these programs, including the extension of credit, have been handled considerably better by multilateral organizations than by a bilateral arrangement. However, if we are to take this recommendation in the bill as reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations factually and realistically, we must accept the amendments offered by the Senator from Alaska.

Part 4 of the bill provides that the foreign aid programs will terminate on July 1, 1967. It also requests the President to submit to Congress his recommendations for a continuation of the aid programs, and specifies the different factors to be considered in extending such a program.

It also provides for setting up a temporary planning committee comprised of four members to be appointed by the President, four from the Foreign Relations Committee, and four from the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives. The committee will be

required to make a final report to Congress not later than January 1, 1967, or approximately 18 months from now.

If we already knew what should be done in revising foreign aid programs, including lending programs, there would not be much need to set up committees or request the President to submit a new program.

In view of that fact, it seems to me that we had better let the situation remain where it is, authorizing the transfer of 10 percent of the funds to the international lending agency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Vermont has expired.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I yield 1 additional minute to the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I believe that we should accept the amendments offered by the Senator from Alaska. However, I would not vote to reduce the 10 percent, or eliminate it, as was suggested yesterday on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this is a conservative amendment. Let me point out some of the loans which have been made by the International Development Corporation, which shows how the money is being disbursed.

In Formosa, there are four loans at three-fourths of 1 percent interest, one for harbor dredging, another for water development, another for municipal supply, and another for the development of private industry.

Please note that the loan for the development of private industry is making our Government money available to private industry at the interest rate of three-fourths of 1 percent, with no repayment on the principal for 10 years and then a 50-year term before the loan is to be paid.

Going on down the line, we find loans to be of the same character. Nowhere does it seem that any effort is being made to save American taxpayers' money. All the loans are at three-fourths of 1 percent. They are all for the same terms, with no repayment on the principal for 10 years, and 50 years to run.

In India, there are about a dozen loans for highway construction and improvement, irrigation, flood control, and so forth.

It is interesting that we cannot seem to do anything about flood control in our own country, but we can give our money away this liberally for flood control purposes in every country of the world except the United States.

Only this year and last year, we witnessed the terrible floods in the Midwest and in the Northwest. The States have come back to the Government year after year after year for help, but do we suppose that States could borrow money from the United States at the rate of three-fourths of 1 percent with no repayment on the principal for 10 years? Of course not.

This is a double standard which I have consistently opposed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator hold the view that either the AID program or IDA is intended as a money-making bank?

Mr. GRUENING. No; not as a money-making bank. Neither was it intended to be a complete giveaway, which is pretty much what it is in a number of areas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is not. These loans are repayable. Formosa is one of the few countries which is making such great progress that this year the AID will discontinue completely its economic assistance to that country.

Mr. GRUENING. How about the Haiti loan, which is now in default, which was made by the International Development Corporation?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I believe that everything is in default in Haiti, at the present time.

Mr. GRUENING. I know that, but the Senator was relating how safe the loans made by the international organization are.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes, but I did not say that it was infallible. It has had relatively greater success than many of the AID programs. We have some AID obligations in default in Haiti also, but on balance the International Bank and its affiliates have done an excellent job. Their standards of lending and their supervision, I believe, have been more efficient because they do not encounter nationalism and resentment on the part of the borrower.

Mr. GRUENING. Why would not the record be an excellent record when based on these generous terms, when we give this money at virtually no interest and let the borrowers have 10 years before any payment is due? Nevertheless, already there has been some default.

Mr. President, I yield such time to the Senator from Oregon as he may require.

Mr. MORSE. I shall not take more than 5 minutes. I am ready to vote. I believe that in fairness to myself and in fairness to the Senator from Alaska I should recapitulate the two main arguments that I made in my major speech on the subject last night.

The amendment in principle is the amendment that the senior Senator from Oregon proposed in committee. It will have substantial support on the floor of the Senate when the yea-and-nay vote is had, as there was substantial support for it in committee. A number of the committee members will vote for it. My two main reasons are that I believe the report of the committee itself, which contains the Morse amendment that provides for creating a special body to make a Federal survey and analysis of the foreign aid program with the requirement of a report on its findings and its recommendations at the beginning of fiscal 1967, justifies our urging that we not adopt a policy change as important as this policy change would be.

This is the type of policy question that ought to go to the special committee for consideration between now and the beginning of fiscal 1967.

Therefore I do not believe that this type of proposal should be added to the

bill this year. If, after careful analysis, the special committee should decide that there is merit in the proposal, I believe we ought to consider it at that time.

The second point, which I discussed at some length last night, is my attitude toward our constitutional system in regard to maintaining congressional checks over the executive branch of Government. This committee proposal, in my judgment greatly weakens the checking power and authority and duty of Congress, because no matter what semantics are used, when all is said and done we transfer out of direct control by Congress the checking authority to pass judgment upon the policies that shall prevail in the expenditure of taxpayer money in the foreign aid program.

The Senator from Alaska has pointed out the side effects of the amendment in connection with the policy that we have already adopted in exercising our power of check through the Hickenlooper amendment and the Lausche-Mundt amendment that we have already adopted. We cannot, in my judgment, reconcile this proposal with the procedures under the Hickenlooper amendment and the Lausche-Mundt amendment in respect to the amount of money that will be transferred to foreign financial agencies, which to a large degree will exercise control over the expenditure of money, without an effective congressional check.

I do not believe this is the time for us to further delegate the authority which I believe to be so precious and that we must have it remain inviolate.

Congress must stop building up a government of executive supremacy in this country. Every time we delegate this kind of control, this degree of checking, we simply vest more and more power in the executive branch of the Government, in this instance in the State Department and in a foreign financial agency, to which we would give ultimate control.

Lastly, it has been pointed out by the supporters of the amendment, both in committee and on the floor of the Senate, that we have a voice in this agency, that we have a voice in the World Bank, that we have a voice in the Inter-American Bank, and that we have a voice in many other international agencies.

Mr. President, I used to teach my students that, although we are a government of laws and not a government of men, and that we must keep our government of laws in order to preserve the freedoms and liberties of the American people, we should never forget that we are a government of laws administered by mere men.

Senators know something about the human relations that develop, the camaraderie, the exchange of agreements, and the compromises—in this instance the support of someone for a compromise on another issue that may develop on the board.

I take judicial notice of the fact that within the international agencies the human factor plays a very important part in working out arrangements and adjustments of policies that become the program of that agency.

We have no effective check on the American representative. It may be said, "You can get him off the board." I say, "Try it."

It may be said, "You can give him instructions." I say, "Try it."

The fact is that we lose congressional control.

Therefore I urge Senators this afternoon to adopt the Gruening amendment, because its adoption would give us time necessary to consider this policy by the group which the Morse amendment, a part of the bill, envisions shall be created to make a thorough analysis of the whole foreign aid program between now and the beginning of fiscal year 1967.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, how much time have I remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 18 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRUENING. I point out that this is an extremely conservative amendment. It merely keeps the situation where it is now. As these loans do not require repayment for 10 years, how do we know how good any of them are? Not one of them will become due for its first payment until 1970 or 1971 or 1972 or 1974 or 1975.

What is more reasonable than to keep the provision that is now in the bill, which permits 10 percent of the money to be loaned, instead of doubling it and going ahead on an uncharted sea, where there is great profligacy as is shown by the loans already made? It is absurd for Congress to double the ante in view of what we have been giving away in the past few years since this International Development Bank was created.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Arkansas in support of the committee amendment to double the amount of multilateral aid which can be furnished.

I direct particular attention to his comment about our trying to promote economic development in selected countries of Asia and Africa by moving some of the loans into the World Bank and its affiliates. We have been shocked in recent years by the spreading all over the world of the slogan "Yankee go home." We have been shocked by the burning of our libraries, by the attacks on our embassies. However, has anyone ever said, "World Bank go home"? Has anyone ever said, "International Development Organization go home"?

Has anyone ever tried to burn down the foreign offices of the World Bank and its affiliates? This in itself is strong justification for extending multilateral aid.

Let me point out that this is not a policy change, as the Senator from Oregon has suggested. The policy of making a certain amount of development loan funds available to international institutions was adopted by Congress in section 205 of the Foreign Aid Act as long ago as 1961. We are not changing any policy. We are merely implementing a policy which a majority

of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations thought was sound.

There is another reason why I believe the committee should be supported, and it is very important. In my judgment, the committee position represents a wave of the future and the Gruening amendments represent a relic of the past. We are in a situation in which an expanding internationalism is becoming essential not only to remedying the vast disparity between the rich nations and the poor nations, but, indeed, to preserve our Western civilization from destruction in a nuclear holocaust. We are moving slowly but surely toward a limited yielding of national sovereignty, a situation in which the 13 States found themselves unable to govern themselves under the Articles of Confederation finally and reluctantly made to the Federal Government, as result of which our country had a great and marvelous growth.

We now have the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the International Labor Organization, the World Health Organization, and a great many other international organizations to which some small part of our national sovereignty has gradually been yielded. Therefore, I take no credence in the suggestion that the Congress ought to keep a tight rein on every dollar which we put into programs of international cooperation. I feel, rather, that it is far wiser to expand the growing internationalism essential to the survival of a complex and completely changing world. It is for that reason, in addition to the reasons stated by the Senator from Arkansas, that I support the committee position.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. The point that disturbs me in relation to the amendment is as follows: What is wrong with the borrower knowing that the money involved is American money coming from America? Why should it be funneled through an international agency, with allegiance being, let us say, to an entity, as against a nation that is actually making the sacrifice to put up the money? What is wrong with that?

Mr. CLARK. There is nothing wrong with it.

Mr. PASTORE. America should be generous. We should have a generous heart. Not long ago I heard that in the Dominican Republic, where we are furnishing food, there was resentment that the food bore a mark "From America." What is wrong with that? If they are going to eat our food, why should not the people know that it has come from us? If they are going to have our money, why should not the people know that the money is coming from us? What is essentially wrong with that?

Mr. CLARK. May I answer the Senator?

Mr. PASTORE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. There is nothing essentially wrong with that. The vast majority of our funds are indicated as coming from America.

I say to my friend the Senator from Rhode Island that it is a question of com-

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12649

monsense. Will we get a better result for each dollar spent if we make it possible for international institutions such as the World Bank, IDA, and the others, to have an expanded amount of capital with which to make available loans to the countries of Africa and Asia? If the Senator should desire—and I am sure he does not, because he is not that kind of individual—we could point with pride all over the world and beat our chests about the great generosity and say, "Look at what Uncle Sam has done for you." I agree there is nothing wrong with that. The only problem is whether it is not more sensible to move an additional amount of loans into the international field, as we have done in connection with the United Nations and the other agencies I have spoken about. There is nothing wrong with what the Senator has stated; it is only a question of what is wise.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Rhode Island does not mean that we should go around beating our breasts and pointing with pride. I do not mean that at all. I believe it is a fallacy to think for one moment that we accomplish more if people do not know where the benefits come from. I would hope that whatever we do, we do the thing that is right in the long run. I do not believe that America ought to be wearing its affluence on its sleeve. I have never said that. I do not mean that. Too often I hear people say that our way of giving is not good, that our aid is resented by people because they know we are giving it. If they resent it, they need not ask for it.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is nothing wrong with giving away money as charity or as anything else. What we are talking about is a lending program. It has been well acknowledged—certainly since the days of Shakespeare—that a borrowing relationship between friends, for example, very often results in some resentment. The lender expects to be paid. A personal feeling goes with a loan, and the borrower feels that he is obligated in a way beyond mere repayment of a loan, and the lender feels that he has done a personal favor, which is aside from business, to the borrower. It is difficult to maintain a satisfactory relationship.

That is one reason why we have banks. I know that in my private life, wise people of my acquaintanceship have always refused to lend directly to friends, but they have helped those friends obtain money through a bank. They do so in order to maintain their personal relations on a proper basis.

The attitude of which I speak enters into our relations with a small country such as Malaysia. Before the Senator came into the Chamber, I believe, I cited an instance in that country.

Mr. PASTORE. I heard the Senator make that reference.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know why they did it, but the fact is, whether we like it or not, for the first time to my knowledge there was a large anti-Amer-

ican demonstration in the capital city because we had insisted on an interest rate on a loan that did not please them. That factor has not entered into the relationships of that country with the Bank.

I am judging by our experience. There is nothing wrong in what the Senator has said. I am not talking about a moral question. It is purely a political, practical question. The Bank has had very satisfactory relations in a lending program and we have had some very unsatisfactory relationships. I know that the record of the Bank is that there has never been a default. Never in its history has there been a single default. I know of instances in which countries have rescheduled their other obligations in order to avoid defaulting to the Bank. They have felt that their reputation with the Bank was at stake, and they have gone to great pains to preserve their reputation with the Bank.

Our own record of bilateral lending, even by private sources to Latin America after World War I, is deplorable. Practically every country down there defaulted. Much ill will resulted. The very fact that we are big and rich exaggerates the problem.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. A psychological problem in relation to loans is created. I do not believe the same thing arises with regard to gifts. They accept malaria control; they accept milk for their children; they accept teachers in their schools. But there is not established a relationship of borrower and lender.

This has not created any bad feeling, but I believe that lending by the great United States to a small country at the kind of rates, for example, that the Senator from Alaska advocates has resulted in ill will and the alienation of those countries rather than a continuation of satisfactory political relationships. It is a fact of life; it is not a moral question.

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I yield.

Mr. PASTORE. First, I have the highest respect for the integrity and the responsibility of the Foreign Relations Committee, especially because of the fact that it is headed by my distinguished friend from Arkansas. But what has he to say to the following question: Now 10 percent can be used for the stated purpose. The committee has decided that the percentage should be increased from 10 percent to 20 percent without changing the overall total figure. Would the increase implicate us to the extent that it would be harder for us to extricate ourselves in the future from the responsibility? Would not such action become an obligation, in a multilateral sense, to many nations, as against dealing with one person? Would the proposed action mean that from now on the percentage rises from 10 percent to 20

percent—and maybe later it may even go above that percentage—but even if it does not, we shall have committed ourselves to 20 percent, and from now on we might as well reconcile ourselves to the fact that the program will be our obligation from now into the future?

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no commitment in the bill beyond the life of the bill.

Mr. President, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The 10 percent is an expression of policy. It has never been implemented. Not one red cent has ever been transferred in accordance with the authorization because the great Appropriations Committee, in its greater wisdom, has refused to appropriate the amount necessary. Instead, it has included a flat prohibition.

In another part of the bill, in addition to section 205, is a statement of policy adopted by the committee. This is not the first one; there have been similar ones. Some time ago there was a statement of policy which I remember specifically. As I recall, it was with regard to Africa. It was felt that loans to new countries should be made on a multilateral basis. I was in favor of that, and so was the committee at the time. The purpose of the negotiation of the loans was to prevent the alienation of those countries.

This proposal is permissive; it provides that the President may make funds available. It is, in a sense, a statement of policy. I believe—and I feel that a majority of the committee believe—that with respect to a lending program of development loans—that is all the policy applies to—it is wise to move in this direction, because it involves fewer political risks. It would be more successful in achieving the purpose of economic development. After all, that is what I assume is the purpose in this instance. That was the judgment of the committee. But it is not the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations, so we have nothing to go on. The Committee on Appropriations has never done anything about it, and I do not know that it will in this instance. But the principle is important.

It is no secret that I am dissatisfied with the way the program has developed. It has involved us in many places where I do not like the conditions. It operates in a good many countries. However, I have tried to do the best I could with what we have.

I support the amendment of the Senator from Oregon for a revision of the program. I am not too hopeful that anything can be done that will change it much. One thing that we hope can be done is to make greater use of the successful international organizations working in this field. For the most part such organizations have been successful; there have been few failures.

Another aspect is that it is hoped that if the President takes advantage of the program, he will use it as a lever to persuade other countries to match us,

and thus make a larger total amount available for development loans.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield me 1 minute?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I direct my remarks to the Senator from Rhode Island. Although the committee report favors this approach, a strong minority in the committee does not share this view.

The Committee on Appropriations tied down the flap in front of the nose. I believe this is the beginning of a program to go beyond 20 percent. I believe that is what is contemplated. In my judgment, it would be a great mistake to do that.

For the time being, we ought to leave well enough alone, or bad enough alone, and await the study that is contemplated in connection with the program.

Mr. PASTORE. What has the Senator from Oregon to say about the observation made by the chairman of the committee; namely, that this program will be used as an instrument to induce other people and other nations to match what the United States does?

Mr. MORSE. There are nations which, if they can succeed in having the jackpot increased by millions of American dollars, will make token loans themselves in order to exercise control over the expenditure of American money. This is not a matching-money proposal. It does not mean that if we put in 20 percent, some other country will put in 20 percent. We should look at the amounts other countries are contributing. It is a token in comparison with what the United States is investing in the international program, on an international sharing basis. I do not buy that argument at all. I reject it.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. I, too, wish to address my remarks to the Senator from Rhode Island.

We do not know yet how these loans will fare. No repayment will be made for 10 years. Yet although this experiment has been in operation briefly, it is now proposed to double the amount. Why not continue with the present 10 percent? Doubling it is what I object to. My amendment does not provide for its repeal. Several Senators yesterday in debate suggested that the program be abolished. I do not go that far.

The chairman of the committee refers to the high interest rates I propose. What are those high interest rates, which occur under the direct aid program? One percent; and after 2 years, 2½ percent. That should not be disastrous to any borrower, when we have to borrow the money from the American people at a cost of twice or three times that amount.

All the international loans are on these generous terms. There never seems to be any discretion. All the loans are made at three-quarters of 1 percent, with no repayment of principal for 10 years, and the life of the loans is 50 years.

Is there any flexibility in the overall analysis of the projects for which we make these foreign so-called loans? Apparently not.

This amendment would merely hold the program in status quo for the next 2 years, and we would proceed on that basis. Why double the amount before we know how the program will work? We do know that these loans are made at negligible interest rates. Actually, they are not loans at all; they are grants.

Mr. President, I am prepared to vote.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, the time for the quorum call to be charged to neither side.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Let the time for the quorum call be charged to my time. The quorum call need only be notice that Senators are prepared to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will proceed to vote on the amendments (Nos. 221 and 224) of the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MORTON (after having voted in the negative). Mr. President, on this vote I have a live pair with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "nay." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would each vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas (Mr. CARLSON) is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON) is absent on official business and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is detained on official business, and his pair has been previously announced.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] is absent on official business, and his pair has been previously announced.

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 46, as follows:

[No. 114 Leg.]

YEAS—40

Aiken	Gruening	Russell, Ga.
Bartlett	Hartke	Simpson
Bible	Holland	Smith
Byrd, Va.	Hruska	Stennis
Cannon	Jordan, N.C.	Symington
Cotton	Jordan, Idaho	Talmadge
Curtis	Lausche	Thurmond
Dominick	McClellan	Tower
Eastland	Morse	Williams, Del.
Ellender	Moss	Yarborough
Ervin	Mundt	Young, N. Dak.
Fannin	Murphy	Young, Ohio
Fong	Robertson	Russell, S.C.
Gore		

NAYS—46

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Monroney
Bass	Hill	Montoya
Bayh	Inouye	Nelson
Bennett	Jackson	Pastore
Doggs	Javits	Pell
Brewster	Kennedy, Mass.	Prouty
Byrd, W. Va.	Kennedy, N.Y.	Proxmire
Case	Kuchel	Randolph
Church	Long, La.	Ribicoff
Clark	McGee	Saltonstall
Cooper	McGovern	Scott
Douglas	McIntyre	Smathers
Fulbright	McNamara	Tydings
Harris	Metcalf	Williams, N.J.
Hart	Miller	Mondale
Hayden		

NOT VOTING—14

Allott	Long, Mo.	Muskie
Burdick	Magnuson	Neuberger
Carlson	Mansfield	Pearson
Dirksen	McCarthy	Sparkman
Dodd		Morton

So Mr. GRUENING's amendments (Nos. 221 and 224) were rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 240

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 240 and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Oregon will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] proposes an amendment to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; namely—

On page 11, line 13, strike out "\$170,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,000,000,000".

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, this amendment reduces the sum for military aid to \$1 billion. The hearings reveal that military aid has increased for Vietnam and for one other country whose name is deleted from the committee hearing.

The reason is that a 5-year agreement was reached with that country which is still secret. It pledges U.S. military aid in the sum of several tens of millions each year. The Congress has not been notified, except when the foreign aid bill was presented with this amount in it for the next fiscal year.

The Congress has never passed on the advisability of this agreement. The American people have never been told of it. Yet when we see the foreign aid presentation for next year, there it is.

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12651

It is a prior commitment. It was never made by Congress nor had Congress ever heard of it; yet we are told it is a commitment on which Congress must make good.

To digress from my brief manuscript, I have just put my finger on one of the greatest evils of our whole foreign aid program, the evil of concealment practiced by this administration against the best interest of Congress and to the great detriment of the American people insofar as their right to full disclosure of the public business is concerned.

This administration is increasingly guilty of concealing from the American people the facts that the American people are entitled to know about if we are to protect the precious right of free men that in a democracy there is no substitute for full public disclosure of the public's business.

I am waiting "all ears" for a Member of the Senate to tell me why the Pentagon, the State Department, and the White House should be allowed to get by with entering into a secret agreement with a foreign country in regard to military aid to that country for a 5-year period that will involve many millions of dollars.

I know that I have probably spoken to my colleagues to the point of boredom, time and time again, during my 20 years in the Senate, about the precious guarantee of the right of the people to know. But during those 20 years there has been a great acceleration of the trend toward government by secrecy and government by executive supremacy.

Let the American people know that they cannot go to any library and find a single example of any country in the history of mankind in which the executive of that country became supreme and the people remained free. Executive supremacy and freedom for the people are irreconcilable, inconsistent concepts of government.

Some of my colleagues in the Senate will say we are not over the abyss yet; it is a matter of degree, and we have not gone that far yet. I believe we go too far when we go a step in the direction of government by executive supremacy.

I should like to answer another argument that we shall hear undoubtedly before we finish with this statement. We shall hear about Vietnam. This amendment has nothing to do with Vietnam. There is no Senator who does not know that if the President continues to prosecute his shocking, illegal war of outlawry in Asia, he will be here time and time again for additional funds to prosecute that war. Vietnam is used in connection with the foreign aid bill every time they think they can make the argument in order to justify a sum in the bill far in excess of what Congress ought to appropriate.

We are in a period of war hysteria. All that need be done is to wave the flag into tatters and the votes will be cast for any waste that is advocated in connection with the foreign aid bill.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. I commend my friend from Oregon and emphasize a point he

has made. This amendment to cut \$170 million off military aid, has nothing to do with Vietnam. The purpose is, hopefully, to arrange a situation in which we shall not give military aid to the Turks so that they can fight the Greeks, or give military aid to the Greeks so they can fight the Turks, or give military aid to Pakistan so it can fight India, or give military aid to India, so that it can fight Pakistan. I strongly support the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I appreciate the Senator's comment very much. I am grateful indeed to the Senator for emphasizing the major thesis of my speech. This proposed cut in military aid has nothing to do with Vietnam. One of my purposes in offering the amendment is to try to get the United States back inside the framework of morality. We are a shockingly immoral Nation with respect to the policy we are following in connection with military aid. The Senator from Pennsylvania has alluded to one phase of this problem. We have fully equipped Greece and Turkey with American military aid so that Greece and Turkey stand as a threat to the peace of the world. The United Nations must maintain a peace-keeping force in Cyprus to prevent the outbreak of a major war in that area of the world. No one knows whether we shall succeed in preventing a war there even under the peacekeeping force of the United Nations.

The United States has equipped, 100 percent, the military establishments of Pakistan and India. When we have done that, we have gone outside the framework of morality. We have equipped two nations that are threatening to make war against each other over Kashmir. The United Nations has had to move into Kashmir in order to give some hope of preventing those two American military-equipped countries from going to war against each other with American equipment.

I was shocked the other day to have colleagues in the Senate say, "But, WAYNE they bought a great deal of this military equipment." Imagine that. Does that make it moral? I say to American labor leaders that the senior Senator from Oregon is exceedingly disturbed in connection with their stand on American foreign policy. Too many American labor leaders seem to think that we can justify these millions of dollars in foreign aid because 80 percent of the money is spent in the United States and thereby makes jobs for American workers.

Let me say to American labor, "I do not intend to support your program in the advocacy of blood money." I yield to no man in Congress or in the country in support of the legitimate objectives of organized labor. But if it is a make-work program for the arms industry which labor desires—what an immoral premise on which to stand.

Mr. President, there are many crying domestic needs in this country for the expenditure of the savings that the senior Senator from Oregon is at least going to give the Senate an opportunity to vote upon in the days immediately ahead that would help strengthen the greatest defense weapon this Republic has; namely,

our domestic economy, for if we weaken that economy, we weaken the strength of the Republic.

I say to American labor that it would be much better to have American workers working in connection with programs that seek to build up the economy of this country than arguing to retain jobs that make it possible for potential belligerents to fight a war against each other with American weapons manufactured by American labor.

I repudiate that argument on the part of American labor leaders. By arguing for military aid on the basis of jobs for workers, they are performing a great disservice to the workers of our country. I suggest to them that they join in a tapering-off program with regard to the manufacture of military equipment and join in the development of a wealth-creating series of programs, such as the great reclamation program across the country, from coast to coast.

The American people must realize that we are in danger of jeopardizing future generations of Americans by leaving to them a heritage of a polluted water supply and a falling water table from coast to coast. Go into any New York City hotel in the very hour at which I speak and read the sign that one will find in every room in every hotel in which there is a water faucet urging conservation of water because New York City is in short supply of water already.

They are greatly concerned about the potential danger, unless the water table starts coming back, of water rationing in the largest city in the land.

Come with me into the West, into the Colorado River Basin, which we think of as a surplus water area, and take note of the great concern of cities in that area in regard to an assurance that there will be an adequate water supply 12 months of the year.

Consider the waste of hundreds of millions of dollars in the foreign aid program. Consider the fact that since 1946 the American taxpayers have been fleeced out of billions of dollars of taxpayers' money in a wasteful and inefficient foreign aid program that has reached, according to the latest figure that was given to me, some \$111 billion since 1946, with billions of that money completely wasted.

Politicians may think that there is no limit to the patience of the American taxpayer. They may think that they can continue to fool the American taxpayer by waving the flag into tatters every year when we get into a historic debate on foreign aid.

I have more confidence in the judgment of American taxpayers than have most politicians. When at long last the American taxpayers catch up with Members of Congress who, year after year, continue to waste money by hundreds of millions of dollars, they will hold them to an accountability at the polls. Their first opportunity will be 1966.

I hope the people will take a toll by way of an accountability of the Congress of the United States at the polls in 1966, if that is the only way we can teach politicians.

Mr. President, when I think of the educational crisis in America, when I think

of what we are doing as a nation of cheaters against the young of this country in denying to them by the tens of thousands an opportunity to develop to their maximum extent their intellectual potential, I am aghast to see Senators vote for a continuation of the waste of hundreds of millions of dollars in a foreign aid program, denying to the young people of our country adequate schools that they need for the education to which they are entitled as a matter of right.

One of the paradoxes is the millions of dollars that we spend each year for schools under a foreign aid bill with no restricted checks placed upon it in foreign lands, and the difficulty we have in obtaining adequate financing to meet the educational crisis in this country.

As chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Education, I say that there are so many phases of the educational problem that pop up in my mind as I raise the issue, that if I did not leave the issue, I should be on it for the rest of the afternoon and be charged with conducting a filibuster. Yet every moment that I might take in discussing the educational crisis of the United States and arguing for a substitution of millions of dollars in the foreign aid bill for expenditures on the schools of America would really be time well spent.

My views are pretty well known to Senators. Let us face it. The votes on the bill are already cast. The lineup has been formed. Pressure has been responded to. Politicians are surrendering right and left to the pressure that states, "You must not disturb the foreign aid bill in an hour of war."

I say that in an hour of war we had better start saving our money so that we can use it to a much greater advantage for the protection and security of our country than using it in connection with the foreign aid program, for I happen to believe that we are on our way now to a major war. Is it not a little amusing to hear the alibis, the rationalizations, and the downright misrepresentations of the State Department in regard to trying to qualify the announcement they made the day before yesterday as to what would go on with regard to American troops in South Vietnam?

To the American people, I say: Here is one Senator and one member of the Committee on Foreign Relations who does not believe the statements that have been uttered by Dean Rusk and by the administration in regard to what the policy is now. It is no different from that which was announced yesterday in regard to the use of American troops in the war in Vietnam.

I say to the American people: Do not be fooled. American boys are now pledged to battle in South Vietnam. American boys are going to die by the thousands in the months ahead if this undeclared, unconstitutional, illegal war is allowed to continue. Of course they are committed to combat. Even Dean Rusk becomes hung up in his own semantics when he issues a statement, as he did yesterday, that they do not sit over there as hypnotized rabbits. Read that statement. One can reach no other conclusion that that Rusk, in spite of

his evasive language, is tacitly admitting that American boys are committed to combat. I am willing to accept that reality.

Mr. President, in this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the devastating answer to the Secretary of State, which is contained in an editorial published in the New York Times this morning entitled "Ground War in Washington." It is also a devastating answer to a large part of the speech of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 10, 1965]

GROUND WAR IN WASHINGTON

The Johnson Administration's decision authorizing a combat role for American troops in South Vietnam is only confirmed by yesterday's White House statement; yet the statement is carefully drafted to give the impression that the United States is not embarking on a radical new course.

The White House admits that General Westmoreland, since March, has had the secondary mission of providing "combat support" to South Vietnamese units in trouble.

But why did Secretary Rusk at the time say that "ground combat personnel is not what is needed" and that there would be "a problem about foreign ground troops undertaking the kind of pacification effort that is required in South Vietnam"?

The White House denies that the President ordered the new combat role in March "or at any other time." It is explained that General Westmoreland's authority was "implied" in the assignment of marines to Da Nang. Yet, how could "implied" authority have been so explicitly defined all along as was finally claimed in yesterday's White House statement? Is there limited to instances when South Vietnamese forces are "faced with aggressive attack when other effective reserves are not available and when in his [Westmoreland's] judgment the military situation urgently requires it."

As recently as last Saturday, the State Department did not mention this role when, at the request of newsmen, it redefined the mission of American troops in a statement reportedly approved at the highest levels of the Department. It admitted that American troops had stepped beyond an advisory role, but described their function simply as defense of American installations and patrolling nearby.

The new role of "combat support," which the State Department finally announced this week, seems to be one of serving as a strategic and tactical reserve for the South Vietnamese Army. It presumably can take American combat troops anywhere in the country. Despite an effort semantically to exclude "offensive" campaigns, it appears to include aid to South Vietnamese units that get into difficulty during offensive as well as defensive operations.

A land war on the continent of Asia, which many of the country's leading military men long have opposed, is not undertaken lightly or without premeditation and careful planning. The doubling of American troops in South Vietnam since March and the reports that the 54,000 now there are being increased to 70,000 suggest implementation of a plan approved in February and prepared much earlier.

The time has come for the President to take the country into his confidence and to give the Congress time for a full debate before the war is escalated any further.

Mr. MORSE. I was much interested in the statements made on the floor of

the Senate yesterday in opposition to a declaration of war. Several Senators expressed their opposition to a declaration of war. It is interesting, is it not? What are they afraid of? To give my interpretation, they are afraid of American public opinion. The American people are entitled to know whether or not this Government is going to make war, and continue to make war, in Asia—and we know that is its intention. If it is, the American people are entitled to receive from the President a proposal for a declaration of war, and they are entitled to receive from Congress a standup count as to who will vote for a declaration of war under article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States.

Let the President bring in that proposal for a declaration of war and confront the American people directly with the issue. Then he will get a direct response from the American people. It is the opinion of the senior Senator from Oregon that the American people are not in support of an undeclared war in Asia. This is contrary to the statement made by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd] on the floor of the Senate today, as to most of which I have already announced that I am in strong disagreement.

The American people are confused, and they will continue to be confused, because of the concealment by the administration of the facts in regard to what is taking place in Asia. The American people are entitled to receive from the administration a clear drawing of the issue. Either we should go to war legally, under article I, section 8, or the President should proceed to reverse his position and take the position I took in Madison Square Garden the night before last. That position is my answer to the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. McGEE], who said earlier today on the floor of the Senate that we who are opposed to the administration's policy in South Vietnam do not offer any alternatives. Mr. President, we have been offering alternatives for most of 2 years, only to be met with, until recently, dead silence on the floor of the Senate, although not in the cloakrooms. In the cloakrooms, there has been strong approval of the alternatives; but only silence, until recently, on the floor of the Senate.

In closing my speech in Madison Square Garden the other night, I said I had no right to criticize my Government in regard to its policies in South Vietnam unless I were willing to offer alternative proposals, which I have been offering for many months.

I said, "We meet here but a few blocks from the temple of international law and justice—the United Nations. I now recommend to my President that he make use of a procedure in the United Nations Charter which we have not made use of yet, but which we ought to make use of, a procedure calling for an extraordinary session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. I recommend that my President walk out onto that historic platform and proceed to make history that will shock the world, by announcing that the United States lays before the United Nations the threat

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12653

to the peace of the world as it now exists in Asia, and that the United States pledges its support to the United Nations to arrive at a peaceful, honorable, negotiated settlement through the procedures of the United Nations, thus bringing to an end the killing in Asia and the threat to the peace of the world."

An interesting incident happened thereafter. There followed for the next hour an increasing demand on the part of the leaders of that rally for a march on the United Nations Building as the best way for that group to symbolize its protest against U.S. outlawry in Asia. It was the best way for that group to symbolize its protest in opposition to the record of the administration of open violation of article after article of the United Nations; in fact, the violation by this country, since 1954, of article after article of the United Nations by the course of action we have followed in Vietnam.

Without my knowing what was really taking place, because I remained on the platform to hear other speakers, arrangements were made with the New York City Police Department for a march on the United Nations. I wrote to the chief of police of the New York Police Department yesterday, expressing my high praise for the way the police department handled the demonstration that followed the meeting. It was announced at 11 o'clock that arrangements had been made with the police for a march from Madison Square Garden to the United Nations Plaza. At 20 minutes before midnight, that march started.

Some Senators would be a little amused to read some of the correspondence I have already received from superpatriots, because I had the high honor and the distinct privilege to join with Dr. Benjamin Spock at the head of that column, while more than 2,500 people out of that audience, at 20 minutes before midnight, 2 by 2, walked down Broadway, across 42d Street, to the Plaza of the United Nations for a second rally that was held at 1 o'clock in the morning.

Mr. President, this administration is whistling by graveyards. But its whistling will not prevent filling all the graves in those graveyards if it thinks that the grassroots of America happen to be in support of its killing in Asia and the offering of no hope to the American people for years to come for an ending of those killings.

In my judgment, if this administration follows its outlawry in Asia, American troops will be bogged down in Asia for a quarter of a century, at the minimum. Then, at long last, we shall have to come to a negotiated settlement that could not possibly be any better than the negotiated settlement that could be reached now, in my judgment.

The rally that was held in New York City the night before last could be held in Chicago, the Twin Cities, San Francisco, St. Louis, Los Angeles, any other major city in the country. This is not a matter of New York locale.

Mr. President, at the roots of America, the American people are concerned about

this bloodletting. They are asking questions. "What will it profit us? Where is the end? What will it accomplish?"

I have been heard to say, during the past 18 months on the floor of the Senate in speech after speech in opposition to this international outlawry of my country in Asia, that we are driving millions of people in the underdeveloped areas of the world into the arms of communism.

We have the greatest weapon to defeat communism that mankind has ever forged. That weapon is not hydrogen bombs. That weapon is not nuclear warfare. That weapon is not military might. That weapon is not the substitution of the jungle law of military force for the rule of law of international justice for the settlement of disputes that threaten the peace of mankind. That weapon happens to be economic freedom, which is the very strength of this Republic. That weapon happens to be the giving to the underdeveloped peoples of the world the right to be free men economically, because that breeds political freedom. It nourishes the development of political freedom.

We have no more chance of exporting political freedom to Asia or to Africa—or, for that matter, to any other underdeveloped area of the world—than I have of walking down to the Washington Monument and putting it on my shoulder and walking away.

Mr. President, we do have a great opportunity to help make the people in the underdeveloped areas of the world economically free. However, we cannot do it until we first have a peace settlement in Asia.

We in the Senate well know my reasons for fighting the \$700 million military program that the President requested for the purpose of fighting an illegal war in Asia. I fought that proposal first because, by his own admission, it was not needed. He used the measure only as a vehicle through which to obtain another vote of confidence from the Senate and the House by which to continue a policy that he never should have started in Asia.

I voted against the measure, too, because I knew that it would not result in the exportation of economic freedom. It would result only in the further exportation of war to Asia.

I suggested the other day, as Senators will recall, with regard to the \$89 million proposal of the President—which was another attempt on his part to get another vote of confidence in his program in Asia—that we cannot build economic projects in the Mekong area of South Vietnam because the area is controlled by the Vietcong and will continue to be controlled by the Vietcong until there is a negotiated peace.

Some of my colleagues did not like that.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have read too many reports and interviewed too many people who have been involved in the administration of our so-called economic aid program in South Vietnam not to know that the Vietcong have succeeded in sabotaging and emasculating and taking

over the so-called economic projects that we have sought to develop in South Vietnam.

The proposal of the President for \$89 million for so-called economic development in South Vietnam will be largely wasted until we get a negotiated peace. We must stop the war. When we get that war stopped, it must be stopped on an honorable basis and stopped on the basis of an understanding that will not permit a massacre and blood bath of the South Vietnamese by the Communists, and will not permit of a blood bath of the Vietcong by the South Vietnamese. Let us not forget that on both sides there are participants who are ignorant and illiterate, and are victims of military forces that control and direct their lives.

I want to bring the direction of their lives by military forces to an end. I want an honorable, negotiated peace. Then I want to see this great, free land of ours beat communism in Asia by the exportation of economic freedom to the people of that area.

That will not take place in a year, 5 years, or 10 years. That would be a long, hard pull. However, I would much rather spend the next 25 years supporting the exportation of economic freedom to Asia than spend billions of dollars of the money of the American taxpayers in trying to support a bogged down U.S. military force in Asia. That force will become bogged down.

I am still waiting, may I say to Mr. McNamara, the Secretary of Defense, for him to come forth with any rebuttal to the oft-repeated advice of General Bradley, to the oft-repeated advice of General Collins, to the oft-repeated advice of General Marshall to the oft-repeated advice of General Eisenhower, and to the oft-repeated advice of General MacArthur, all of whom told us—great American military strategists and military staff leaders that they are—that Asia is no place to bog down an American army.

It is still true. I happen to believe that nuclear bombs and atomic bombs have not changed it. I call again on the Defense Establishment for a rebuttal of the advice to which I have alluded.

There are many other domestic needs confronting the country in which the millions of dollars I am seeking to save out of the wasteful foreign aid program provided for in this bill can be of great help in providing economic security in this country. They are well known to the Members of this body—great public works programs, the great urban renewal program, the great need for slum clearance programs. Millions of dollars more will be needed if we are ever to have an effective poverty control program.

Any dollar of saving we are willing to vote out of the foreign aid bill will produce much more good, eventually, for the world if spent to meet domestic needs here at home, because in that way we will strengthen our Nation at home and will then be in a stronger position to be of assistance with sound programs involving the exportation of economic freedom abroad than will ever be the case if we

June 10, 1965

continue to waste huge sums of money under this bill.

The last remark I want to make by way of digression from the manuscript deals with the argument Senators will hear over and over again in the days ahead—that this is a very economical foreign aid bill; that it is a barebones bill; that it provides for only \$3,380 million.

Mr. President, that sounds good, but even if it stood alone—and it does not stand alone—this so-called bare-bones bill has hulks and humps of fat upon it.

The foreign aid bill must be considered in terms of the total foreign assistance bill. The total foreign assistance bill amounts to nearly \$7 billion—not \$3,380 million.

Mr. President, on this amendment I am asking for a saving of \$170 million. I repeat, it does not interfere in the slightest with Vietnam. Everyone knows that Vietnam is now in a class by itself. Everyone knows that so long as American boys are being killed in Vietnam, the administration is in a position to come before the Congress and ask for whatever funds it thinks necessary to supplement its financial needs in Asia. But the \$170 million I am asking to have taken out of the military foreign aid program deals with other countries.

The Foreign Assistance Act has been amended to eliminate military aid to Western Europe except for "prior commitments." It contains certain restrictions on military aid to Latin America, except for "prior commitments."

In many ways this is a futile exercise because it is the Department of Defense that enters into these commitments, not the Congress, and because we are not told of them in advance, they are all "prior commitments," so far as Congress is concerned.

Senators who are not members of the Foreign Relations Committee should sit with me on that committee and listen to the testimony we receive from the Defense Establishment, the State Department, and the AID Agency. Talk about making a saving in some of these expenditures, and the representatives of the Defense Department, the State Department, or the AID Agency say, "Oh, we have an agreement on that." Who entered into the agreement? The Congress? Of course not. For Congress to enter into it would be unthinkable. It would merely be carrying out the basic principles of representative government. It would be consistent with our democratic processes. It would be in keeping with our professing of a government of law, and not of men.

These commitments are made in secret conferences. These commitments are made by the executive branch of the Government without the advance knowledge of the Congress. When we ask, "Did you not tell those countries there was no constitutional authority to bind this Government?" They say, "Well, we told them it was subject to the approval of the Congress." Then they come in with the clincher argument. Senators should see my colleagues, will before this sophistry: "It was a hard agreement to negotiate. It was difficult to get them

to agree. We had to work long and hard to get certain concessions out of them. We do not believe you will want to turn down an agreement that we worked so hard to negotiate. We hope you will not want to do so."

Let me say to the Congress that until it starts turning down such agreements, until it starts making clear to the executive branch of the Government that Congress is entitled to give a approval in advance of any agreement, there will be an increase, at a rapid rate, of this gallop down the road toward government of this country by executive supremacy.

Mr. President, I am not at all moved by the fact that the Defense Department, the State Department, and the AID officials have entered into secret agreements, so far as prior knowledge of Congress is concerned, and the argument that we should not reduce the military aid program because it might interfere with some of those agreements. Such agreements are not binding on Congress. Congress has the authority, if it is necessary to make savings in the military assistance aspects of the bill, to reduce any amounts that any representatives of the State Department, the Defense Department, or the AID officials have provided in the agreements they have entered into. It should be done for the people. They are entitled to that protection by the Congress.

Now we have a new prior commitment on which Congress and the American people will have to pay for 5 years. Yet all these secret commitments and the military aid for Vietnam still take only little more than half the total requested for military aid.

In 1963, the committee headed by General Clay to study the foreign aid program took no serious issue with the theory of military aid—whatever that theory may be. But it did protest the number of countries receiving military aid, and made it clear that we should be contemplating a military aid program of not more than \$1 billion a year.

Mr. President, we had it down to \$1.055 billion last year; but under this bill it is back up to \$1.170 billion.

It will go much higher than that again if Congress has not the capacity to say "no."

One of the annual justifications offered for military aid is that it makes available millions of more men from other countries, particularly from Asia, who will be on hand to fight any Communist attack or aggression.

Well, the Communist attack is underway in South Vietnam. Yet there are no millions of Asians from Japan or South Korea or Taiwan or the Philippines, or Thailand, or Pakistan, or India, helping American troops do the fighting. They have our money and our military aid but not to help us do any of the fighting, except for a token force from South Korea, a token force from Australia—about which there is great doubt as to whether there is any commitment for them to go anywhere near the line of battle—and a token force offered from the Philippines.

Our so-called Asian allies have walked out on us, so far as the war in Asia is

concerned, but they are taking their military aid from us by the millions of dollars. They are perfectly willing to spend our money to build up their own military prestige and to keep themselves in a position where they can threaten to make war on their neighbors.

As I have been heard to say many times, but in the interests of consistency I wish to repeat, the military aid we have supplied to any of these countries—I do not care which one is named—India, Pakistan, Greece, Turkey, Thailand, any other country—will be of absolutely no value to the United States in case of war with Russia.

Mr. President, that is my answer to the sophistry of Senators who each year are heard to say, "Oh, but it is cheaper to keep a Pakistani in uniform than an American boy. It is cheaper to keep a South Korean in uniform than an American boy. It is cheaper to keep a Turk in uniform than an American boy."

There is no cause-to-effect relationship in that kind of argument, because it is a complete non sequitur. If there ever is a war between the United States and Russia, every one of those countries will be dependent for its protection not upon the military aid which the United States has supplied them, but upon the nuclear power of the United States.

In case of war between the United States and Russia, it will be a nuclear war—a war which will be over quickly, in an exceedingly short time. Out of it will come no victors, American or Russian. Out of it will come only world devastation.

Mr. President, the military route is not the road to peace. The military route is the road to continued war, ending up eventually in a nuclear holocaust.

I would rather be condemned in my day by the superpatriots and by those who believe that force is the answer to the threat to peace, by those who have substituted their adrenal glands for their cortexes in facing the issue of war or peace.

Mr. President, I will not walk out on a great ideal which has always symbolized my country; namely, that we believe in a peaceful approach to the threat to peace.

It is not true that military aid to these countries will strengthen the security and the defense of the United States.

The ugly reality is that our military aid to many countries in the world has greatly increased the danger of war.

This morning or yesterday there was reported affirmation of a matter with respect to which I warned the Senate about not so many days ago, that our Government is in the process of selling to Saudi Arabia more than \$100 million worth of weapons.

What a blot on our history.

The danger is great. No more than Lady Macbeth will we be able to wipe out that bloody spot. For that aid to Saudi Arabia is aid which will increase the warmaking power of the Arab States. The Arab States continue to threaten to drive into the sea, up to the moment that I speak, the only free nation in all the Middle East, the State of Israel.

June 10, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

12655

I hold no brief for any mistakes of Israel, but we cannot justify strengthening the military power of Arab countries which threaten to destroy Israel. As I have been heard to say, I am opposed to military aid to any country in the Middle East, including Israel, for military aid to countries in the Middle East increase the danger of war.

I have stated earlier in my speech that the position of my country in the matter of military aid cannot be reconciled with morality.

I say to my administration today, "Your proposal to send \$100 million in arms and military equipment to Saudi Arabia is shockingly immoral. History will condemn us for it, for I am convinced that if you continue to build up such war machines as we are building up in the Middle East, the end will be war."

We seem to have hurt feelings when critics abroad charge us with being a hypocritical nation, when the ugly reality is that the United States is a hypocritical nation. Our record in foreign policy is a record of hypocrisy. We profess one thing and we practice another. That is hypocrisy. We profess to believe in the rule of law, but we refuse to resort to an application of the rule of law under existing treaty obligations, which really place a compelling duty upon us to resort to the procedures of those treaties to which we have affixed our signature.

Are treaties signed by the United States to be but a scrap of paper, except when we believe that carrying out their provisions might be, momentarily, in our national, selfish interest? We cannot maintain peace in the world on the basis of any such premise or any such policy as that.

Mr. President, we are hearing from faint noises that suggest that troops from Taiwan might be landed to fight in South Vietnam. Or they might be used as a threat against mainland China. Who would pay for that? Why, it would take more military aid out of Uncle Sam's pocket.

Do not forget that for 6 or 7 years we sent tens of millions of dollars worth of military aid to South Vietnam on the basis that it would enable that country to do its own fighting and defend itself. But when a real challenge was encountered, Americans have come to do the fighting not just in the air or on the sea, but now on the ground.

That is what will happen in South Korea, too, and in Taiwan if either of them is ever put to the test. And their troops are not going to join Americans in South Vietnam in any but the most token numbers. Of Indians, and Pakistanis, and Japanese we will see none at all. The Indians and Pakistanis are concentrating on fighting each other with American military aid.

I point out to the Senate, and to the American people, that the war has come to Asia, and despite the billions and billions of military aid we have given to Asian countries since the end of World War II, their forces have not joined us in the battle. That is perhaps as much our choice as theirs, because it would

cost us tens of billions more to support both their armed forces and their national economies in any kind of a war effort. Every one of the 2,106 South Koreans in Vietnam, for example, is financed by American money. I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the table from page 643 of the committee hearing showing free world assistance for Vietnam.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TYNDERS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Free world assistance for Vietnam

Country	Nature of aid	Persons in RVN
Australia.....	Combat advisers, aircraft and crews, medical aid, technical aid, civil action aid, and radio stations.	200
Canada.....	Medical aid, scholarships, and wheat.	1
China.....	Agricultural aid [deleted], electric power aid.	124
Germany.....	Professors, technical experts, credits, and 30 ambulances.	23
Italy.....	Surgical team.	17
Japan.....	Electric power aid, medical aid, ambulances, and transistor radios.	80
Korea.....	Karate instructors, mobile Army surgical hospital, combat engineers with security forces.	2,106
New Zealand.....	Army engineers, surgical team, and educational aid.	32
Philippines....	Medical aid, psywar assistance.	34
Thailand.....	[Deleted] cement and roofing.	(1)
United Kingdom.....	[Deleted]. Police instructions, professor, educational and technical equipment.	12
Netherlands.....	Surgical team.	10

¹ Deleted.

NOTE.—The French, though their policies in South Vietnam differ from ours, continue to have a number of educators, medical and technical personnel there.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the contention that military aid and supporting assistance was guaranteeing us allies and allied manpower in the event of an Asian war has been proved false by the war in Vietnam. I strongly suspect that a war anywhere else will prove it wrong in most parts of the world.

Of the countries shown in the chart, we have not extended any direct military aid to Canada, New Zealand, or Australia, though they have received some through channels of regional aid. But through fiscal year 1964, China had received \$2,458 billion from us in military aid. Germany had received \$951.6 million; Italy, \$2,312 billion; the Netherlands, \$1,242 billion; the United Kingdom, \$1,035 billion; Japan, \$1,057 billion; Korea, \$2,191 billion; the Philippines, \$445 million; and Thailand, \$68 million through 1963.

I do not mean to single out these countries for criticism because they at least have some people in South Vietnam, even if they are not combatants. Dozens of other recipients of U.S. military aid over the years have no one there at all.

Nor do I believe we should continue to increase our military aid program in the absence of some indication of its future objectives. Take, for example, the constant question of obsolescence. Each year the Foreign Relations Committee is

told that country A or B needs new tanks to replace some we furnished them 5 years ago and which are now "obsolete." Or we are told that a given army must be reequipped because our earlier military aid is now obsolete. That is good for the military equipment manufacturers.

Who knows what the standards are for obsolescence? And who knows how long we plan to go on arming the world with new material? There is never a point at which some nation's military equipment will not become obsolescent. Do we intend to go on indefinitely replacing existing equipment with new?

Never in the life of the military aid program have I heard any indication from the Defense Department of the anticipated future programming for military aid.

There is another important omission from our projected military aid program. That is an estimate of how much it would cost the United States to support any one of these countries in the event it became involved in a major war. Some are saying that the soldiers of Taiwan should be transported to mainland China to divert China away from Vietnam; or that Taiwan troops should be moved to South Vietnam to fight in the war against the guerrillas. But none of these voices ever tells us how much it would cost the United States to support a war economy in Taiwan. Would it be enough that we would have to arm, equip, and supply all her soldiers? Or would our economic aid to Taiwan also have to be expanded, as some form of lend-lease?

Here again, we went through all this with South Vietnam. But the cost of maintaining South Vietnam on a war footing has vastly exceeded the cost of maintaining her even in the years immediately after the French withdrawal.

I have no sympathy for the argument that military aid to undeveloped countries gives us something for nothing, or that it gives us cheap manpower for use in place of American soldiers. Nothing of the sort has happened in the one place where a war is going on.

Yet this is the basis for our military aid in most parts of the world. It should be examined right down to its roots. In the meantime, the level should not go above \$1 billion.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment, the essence of which is to reduce the amount of 20 percent in the pending bill to be used in the discretion of the administration for multilateral aid. My amendment would reduce that 20-percent allowance to 12 percent. In principle, it is identical with the proposal that was voted upon at 1:30 this afternoon, the Gruening amendments, to reduce the 20 percent to 10 percent. My amendment would reduce the 20 percent to 12 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on

June 10, 1965

the amendment be had at 5 minutes after 3, 10 minutes from now. In the meantime, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. RUSSELL], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] would vote "yea."

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] is paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN]. If present and voting, the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea," and the Senator from Alabama would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT] and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] are absent on official business and, if present and voting, would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 63, as follows:

[No. 115 Leg.]

YEAS—22

Bartlett	Ervin	Morse
Bible	Gruening	Nelson
Church	Hart	Pell
Clark	Hartke	Proxmire
Cotton	Hruska	Randolph
Curtis	Long, La.	Young, Ohio
Douglas	McClellan	
Ellender	McGovern	

NAYS—63

Aiken	Dirksen	Hill
Anderson	Dodd	Holland
Bayh	Dominick	Jackson
Bennett	Eastland	Javits
Boggs	Fannin	Jordan, N.C.
Brewster	Fong	Jordan, Idaho
Byrd, W. Va.	Fulbright	Kennedy, Mass.
Cannon	Gore	Kennedy, N.Y.
Case	Harris	Kuchel
Cooper	Hickenlooper	Lausche

Mansfield	Mundt	Smit h
McGee	Murphy	Sterns
McIntyre	Pastore	Symington
McNamara	Prouty	Talbidge
Metcalf	Ribicoff	Thurmond
Miller	Robertson	Tower
Mondale	Russell, Ga.	Tydings
Monroney	Saito	W. James, N.J.
Montoya	Scott	W. James, Del.
Morton	Simpson	Yarborough
Moss	Smathers	Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—15

Allott	Hayden	Muskie
Baas	Inouye	Neuberger
Burdick	Long, Mo.	Peacock
Byrd, Va.	Magnuson	Russell, S.C.
Carlson	McCarthy	Spakman

So Mr. MORSE's amendment was rejected.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JAVITS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. PROXMIRE obtained the floor.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield to permit me to call up an amendment?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, without losing my right to the floor, I may yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment which is at the desk and ask that it be read and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 18, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

(3) add the following new subsection:

"(n) No assistance shall be furnished under this Act, and no sales shall be made under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, to the United Arab Republic or to Indonesia so long as either of such countries shall continue to commit aggression, as the President shall determine in accordance with section 620(i) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended."

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, on this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. PROXMIRE obtained the floor.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield briefly to the Senator from Oregon without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE U.S. USE OF A LOBBYIST AS INTERMEDIARY WITH A DOMINICAN POLITICIAN

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a statement to make as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs.

One of the more disturbing elements in our troubles with the Dominican Republic is one that need not have occurred and which certainly need not have occurred and which certainly need not continue. It is the use by the United States of a lobbyist as intermediary with a Dominican politician

The lobbyist is I. Irving Davidson, and

the Dominican he represents is Joaquin Balaquer. Mr. Balaquer was President of the Dominican Republic for a time after the death of Trujillo.

I do not doubt that Balaquer is still a factor in Dominican politics, and he rightly should be considered as a possibility for public office there again. Moreover, I expect the United States to have some contacts with him as we seek to put together a new government down there, pending new elections.

But to use Mr. Davidson as the intermediary is completely unnecessary and cannot help but cloud still further the good intentions of the United States. Let us face the fact that our virtual occupation of the Dominican Republic and our current, undisguised intention of installing a new government favorable to the United States is not exactly enhancing our standing or our good name in the Western Hemisphere. It is a dirty business at best.

But we are making it dirtier by including in our dealings a paid lobbyist who has advertised his claimed connections with the President by advising his clients in Central America that in 1960 he had assurances from the "L.B.J. policy board" that there will be a general housecleaning of the policymakers of the State Department for Central America, and that the same "L.B.J. policy board" had also promised him "first refusal for representations—ambassadorial, military, et al."

Mr. Davidson made these claims in a letter to Señor Luis Somoza, of Nicaragua, its President, and one of his clients, in a letter dated July 7, 1960. This letter and Mr. Davidson's testimony about it came up in the inquiry of the Foreign Relations Committee into the activities of agents for foreign governments. I ask unanimous consent that portions of the testimony of Mr. Davidson before the committee in 1963 be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Davidson is an influence peddler. Among his clients in 1963 were President Somoza of Nicaragua, Ecuadorian sugar interests, Israeli military interests, and economic and military interests of Indonesia. On behalf of these clients, he seeks grants and loans under the foreign aid program and sugar quotas.

Today, Mr. Davidson's clients also include President Duvalier of Haiti, and a Texas company controlled by the Murdoch family. Two weeks ago, the Justice Department asked Mr. Davidson to register as a representative of Mr. Balaquer as well, which he has not done on the ground that his relations with Balaquer were conducted at the request of the State Department.

One of the items that was included in our hearing record was a letter from Mr. Davidson to President Somoza in 1956, in which he told him:

The colonel is cooperating with me on several good public relations moves, which will be very beneficial for Nicaragua. For instance, he has taken five tickets for the Eisenhower dinner to be held here on January 20. These tickets, which sell for \$100 each are

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000600130002-0

UNCLASSIFIED	CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET
--------------	--------------	--------

CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY
OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	Mr. Elder 7D5617	6/15	WS
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
ACTION	DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY	
APPROVAL	DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION	
COMMENT	FILE	RETURN	
CONCURRENCE	INFORMATION	SIGNATURE	

Remarks:

Your attention is called to page 12646.

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.

DATE

Legislative Counsel, 6D0109

Approved For Release 2005/07/13 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000600130002-0

UNCLASSIFIED	CONFIDENTIAL	SECRET
--------------	--------------	--------